

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 13, 14, 19, 20, and 27 have been amended in the instant amendment.

Claims 33-38 have been cancelled in the instant amendment.

Claims 39-44 have been added in the instant amendment.

Accordingly, claims 1-31 and 39-44 are now pending.

Claim Objections

Claims 33-38 stand objected to because the order of claims 33-38 is not correct.

Claims 33-38 should be in the order of 32 to 37 rather than the order of 33 to 38.

Applicant has amended the claims to correct this informality. In particular, Applicant has cancelled claims 33-38 and has added new claims 39-44 to correct the informality.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-31 and 33-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,397,145 B1 to *Millington* [hereinafter *Millington*]. This rejection is understood to be based in part on the premise that *Millington* teaches a navigation system and method for guiding a driver from one position to a destination via a maneuver instruction, in which a position of the vehicle is determined by a GPS receiver, a route segment on which the vehicle is located is identified as a function of the position of the vehicle, and the route segment is identified using a graphic user

interface (GUI). The rejection is further understood to be based in part on the premise that *Millington* teaches that a user can use an input device for entering a specific destination relative to the database of roads, and the navigation system then displays a recommended route as well as turn-by-turn instructions to the user.

Applicant traverses the rejection. As disclosed at column 4, lines 2-25 of *Millington*, the user can select a destination relative to the database of roads using an input device and a display. The navigation system then calculates and displays a recommended route directing the driver of the vehicle to the desired destination. The navigation system may also display turn-by-turn instructions on the display and may give audible instructions using an audio speaker, guiding the driver to the desired destination.

Millington discloses at column 4, lines 3-5, that "the user can select a destination relative to the database 36 of roads utilizing the input device 28 and the display 24." *Millington* does not disclose any use of the input device 28 other than for selecting a destination. In particular, *Millington* does not disclose receiving a user input via an input device and using the GUI to render a previous route segment or a subsequent route segment in response to the user input, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons presented above, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Millington*. Claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1, incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore are also not anticipated by *Millington*.

The above reasoning relating to claim 1 applies to claim 8 with equal force. Accordingly, claim 8 is not anticipated by *Millington*. Claims 9-13, which depend from claim 8, incorporate all of the limitations of claim 8 and therefore are also not anticipated by *Millington*.

The above reasoning relating to claim 1 applies to claim 14 with equal force. Accordingly, claim 14 is not anticipated by *Millington*. Claims 15-20, which depend from claim 14, incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore are also not anticipated by *Millington*.

The above reasoning relating to claim 1 applies to claim 21 with equal force. Accordingly, claim 21 is not anticipated by *Millington*. Claims 22-26, which depend from claim 21, incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore are also not anticipated by *Millington*.

The above reasoning relating to claim 1 applies to claim 27 with equal force. Accordingly, claim 27 is not anticipated by *Millington*. Claims 29-31 and 39, which depend from claim 27, incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore are also not anticipated by *Millington*.

The above reasoning relating to claim 1 applies to claim 40 with equal force. Accordingly, claim 40 is not anticipated by *Millington*. Claims 41-44, which depend from claim 40, incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore are also not anticipated by *Millington*.

Conclusion

The amendments to the claims presented above are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
for the Applicant
by Attorneys,

MOORE, HANSEN & SUMNER
Customer No. 22,854
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 4850
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 332-8200

Date: August 16, 2004

By: 

Allen J. Oh, Registration No. 42,047